NO. 89-CR-83-05-E



IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA

3 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

PLAINTIFF,

VS)

DAVID ROYCE LADD,

DEFENDANT.

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCESTINGS

SENTENCING

BEFORE THE HONORABLE JAMES O. ELLISON, JUDGE

TUESDAY, APRIL 15, 1990

TULSA, OKLAHOMA

APPEARANCES

FOR THE PLAINTIFF: MR. JOHN MORGAN

ASSISTANT US ATTORNEY

TULSA, OKLAHOMA

FOR THE DEFENDANT: MR. JOHN E. DOWDELL NORMAN & WOHLGEMUTH

2900 MID-CONTINENT TOWER TULSA, OKLAHOMA 74103

MARY ANN MCGINTY, REPORTER

2

4

5

6

7

8

•

9

10

. .

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

PROCEEDINGS

Tuesday, April 15, 1990

THE COURT: First sentencing this morning is 89-Criminal-83-05, United States of America versus David Royce Ladd. Jack Morgan appears for the United States, John Dowdell for Mr. Ladd.

MR. MORGAN: Good morning, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Good morning, Mr. Morgan. Good morning
Mr. Dowdell.

MR. DOWDELL: Good morning, Judge.

THE COURT: Are there any revisions, objections to the pre-sentence report in Mr. Ladd's case? Mr. Morgan, do you have any comment? I know the Government has filed a motion and I have reviewed that motion. But in addition, do you have any comment that you would like to make for this record?

MR. MORGAN: No. We find the pre-sentence report professionally done. We make no objections or take exceptions thereto. We do have present today in court, the case agent Mr. Scott Horton, if Your Honor desires to hear from him concerning the substantial assistance.

I don't know necessarily that it would have to be in camera. I don't believe there would be any hostility to the Defendant if it was disclosed in open court.

THE COURT: Very well. If that's the feeling of the

Government.

1

2

3

5

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Do you have any objection to it being held by the Court in open court?

MR. DOWDELL: I do not.

THE COURT: All right, fine. If you will be seated then. If the witness would come forward and be sworn, I would like to hear that testimony.

MR. MORGAN: Thank you, Your Honor. At this time the Government would call Scott Horton.

SCOTT HORTON,

called as a witness on behalf of the Plaintiff, being first duly sworn, testified as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. MORGAN:

MR. MORGAN: Your Honor, may I stand here?

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. MORGAN: Thank you.

Q For the record, please, would you tell us your name, please?

A Scott Horton.

Q And would you spell your last name for the Court reporter?

A H-0-R-T-0-N.

Q All right. I think if you would pull that up a little bit closer to you. Are you the case agent in United States of

America versus Paul Thimmesch, also known as Lassley, Hall,
Jr., Marteney Ladd and Michael Steven Hall?

A That is correct.

Q And have you been involved in this particular investigation since its inception, I believe in February of 1989?

A That is correct.

And you've been in a position where you have been able to evaluate not only the evidence in the case but the cooperation of the Defendants; is that right?

A That is correct, sir.

During the course of Judge Ellison's involvement in this case, you have likewise worked with other co-defendants namely Loran Hall, Jr., Barbara Ann Marteney and Michael Steven Hall; is that right?

A That is true.

Q And have they provided you with assistance?

A Yes, sir, they have.

Q All right. And that assistance you've previously spoken of and informed Judge Ellison of that also, haven't you?

A That is correct.

Q Have you been in a good position then to evaluate David Royce Ladd in his interview and debriefing and cooperation in regard to the testimony that you've gotten from the other co-defendants?

Yes, sir, I have.

2

3 4

5

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

All right. Can you explain to Judge Ellison then whether or not you feel this has been of honest, substantial assistance to the prosecution in this case and what aid and assistance it will be?

Yes, sir. In my opinion, Mr. Ladd upon his interview was very open and honest about admitting to the actual overt acts contained in the indictment. Also his statements did corroborate statements made by Loran Eugene Hall, Jr., Michael Hall and Barbara Marteney as to his involvement and the times and locations of that involvement.

Further, have we also an agreement and understanding with Mr. Hall that should-- or excuse me, Mr. Ladd, that should Loran Eugene Hall, Sr., go to trial, that he would be a willing and cooperative witness for the Government in that case?

Yes, sir. Mr. Ladd has assured me of his cooperation in the form of testimony against Loran Eugene Hall, Sr., the remaining Defendant in this case should they go to trial.

Okay. Now, can you tell the Court briefly without going into any great detail, how this testimony would affect Hall. Sr.? That is, what does Mr. Ladd have to say about Mr. Hall? Mr. Ladd could go into detail about contacts made with Mr. Hall on or about the spring of 1988 and Mr. Ladd's association with the Defendant Loran Eugene Hall, Sr., and the

manufacturing processes that occurred in Burns, Kansas. He can also go into detail about weapons observed during that time period, statements made by Loran Eugene Hall, Sr., as to his criminal involvement.

What about the purchase of precursor chemicals? Was that also--

A That is correct. He admitted to his involvement in the purchase of precursor chemicals and likewise to Loran Eugene Hall's involvement into those purchases also.

Q Did he indicate to you who if anyone was the leader of the organization?

A To his knowledge Loran Eugene Hall, Sr., would have been the leader of the organization.

MR. MORGAN: I have no further questions.

THE COURT: Any questions?

MR. DOWDELL: Just one question, Your Honor, if I might.

THE COURT: All right.

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. DOWDELL:

Q Mr. Horton, in the course of your questioning Mr. Ladd, did you find that he had any trouble recalling specific dates or details upon your initial questions?

A That is correct. He did have some difficulty recalling dates and details. He attributed this to a, I believe, a head

injury that had occurred prior to his arrest.

MR. DOWDELL: Thank you. No further questions.

THE COURT: Very well. What was Mr. Hall's level of participation in comparison with other defendants who have been, because of their level of participation, granted probation by this Court? Where did he fit in.

THE WITNESS: Loran Eugene Hall, Sr.?

THE COURT: No, no. I'm sorry, I misspoke. Mr. Ladd.

THE WITNESS: Mr. Ladd was asked upon by Loran Eugene Hall, Sr., and also Loran Eugene Hall, Jr., to purchase precursor chemicals from a chemical store in Grand Prairie, Texas. He did so at their request. He also accompanied Loran Eugene Hall, Sr., to on or about Burns, Kansas and assisted in the manufacturing process.

THE COURT: Is it your testimony that his participation in comparison with others that have been sentenced by this Court was minimal.

THE WITNESS: I would say that his participation was less than Loran Eugene Hall, Jr.'s, but also greater than Barbara Marteney's.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you very much.
Anything further?

MR. MORGAN: Nothing further, Your Honor.

THE COURT: You may be seated.

 THE WITNESS: All right. Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: You may approach the bench. Mr. Dowdell, do you have any comments to make about the pre-sentence report?

MR. DOWDELL: We do have some. There are some relatively minor discrepancies, Your Honor, between Mr. Ladd's version of the facts and those found in the pre-sentence report. If I could, I might just address those in my statement to the Court.

THE COURT: All right, fine. If you would do it in that way.

MR. DOWDELL: There are just a few items which I would like to elaborate on because I do not believe they have been adequately developed in the pre-sentence report or other pleadings which have been filed in the case which might apprise the Court of all of the circumstances relating to Mr. Ladd.

Most significantly is the construction accident to which Mr. Horton just alluded, which occurred in September of 1986. At that time Mr. Ladd was the victim of a severe accident in which he fell on a construction site and had—was ultimately diagnosed to be the victim of brain damage as a result of this accident.

He has since that time, Judge, been treated by a host of doctors and I do not want to belabor these proceedings

and the Court with all of the correspondence with those doctors, which would detail what his history of physical and mental health has been since that time.

However, there was one letter from a Doctor Jonathan Walker, an MD, in Richardson, Texas, who began treating Mr. Ladd in October of 1988. That letter was attached to our petition to enter a plea of guilty as Exhibit B. And if I could, I would like to provide a copy of that to the Court because I think that it capsulizes what his problem has been.

THE COURT: May I take a moment to read it?

MR. DOWDELL: You may, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you.

MR. DOWDELL: The reason I think that this is especially significant, Judge, is that as I said, there are discrepancies between Mr. Ladd's version and the pre-sentence report. I do not think that they need in any way alter these proceedings or require any supplementation.

The important point is this: David Ladd has admitted criminal conduct. However, I do believe that this might explain those discrepancies in that since October of 1988, at the latest, Mr. Ladd has suffered a series of epileptic seizures.

He has, in fact, suffered at least, according to this letter, one coma which lasted for a period of from three to eight days. It's not clear exactly how long. Since this

 incident, this particular coma, Mr. Ladd has been in a comatose state on three different occasions. Once in 1988 and twice in 1989.

His problems with seizures are largely under control now. He is under medication, one medication Depakote. He has not had a seizure for three to five months, I believe.

But as I said, I wanted to call this to the attention of the Court, inasmuch as the letter details a history of the seizure and, in fact, brain damage as a result of this accident. This letter was prepared, Judge, for submission to the Texas Employment Commission, when Mr. Ladd was seeking employment after the accident.

I don't think it was very helpful in that regard but it's also important that the dates, not only of this letter, but of the events described in the letter are precisely the same dates and precisely the same time that Mr. Ladd became involved with Loran Hall and Michael Hall and Loran Hall, Jr., and Barbara Marteney.

He was unemployed. He had obviously some significant problems health-wise and mentally and I think that that is an important consideration.

He does, however, admit criminal conduct.

Specifically, he admits the purchase on a number of occasions and this is one of the points that we disagree on how many occasions. We say five or six and the Government says nine

and he says that Mr. Ladd told him that in an interview.

But he purchased precursor chemicals and glassware knowing what that would be used for and on at least one occasion attempted to assist Loran Hall, Sr., in the manufacture of methamphetamine. In view of the Government's substantial assistance motion, a downward departure obviously can be considered by the Court and is authorized.

However, I do think that the policies of the sentencing guidelines when considered in view of the circumstances of this case are interesting. Here we have three Defendants, three co-defendants, who have been sentenced to 16 months incarceration, 12 months in one day incarceration, and five years probation respectively.

And although I am not in a position to tell the court what sentence should be rendered with respect to Mr. Ladd, I do believe that under these circumstances in view of what the other Defendants' sentences have been, in view of the substantial assistance rendered by Mr. Ladd, that a sentence of incarceration is not appropriate in this case.

A year ago almost to the day, Judge, Mr. Ladd left Balch Springs, Texas, where he got involved with the Halls and Marteneys and he moved back to North Canton, Ohio, where he is from and where his family lives. And he did this in order to get away from the situation, in order to extricate himself from his involvement with these people.

He-- not only was David involved with these people, but his wife was as well. And his children were friends with their children and he has a wife and three children, Judge. I think that's clear in the PSI.

But I think the Court should know that he has moved back to a situation where he has extended family. Mr. Ladd has come here today with his parents, sitting in the front row here. Mr. and Mrs. Ladd who live in North Canton. Ohio.

He has the benefit of their supervision and their support there in North Canton, Ohio, unlike the situation in Balch Springs. And under those circumstances I would request that the Court consider the propriety of a sentence which does not include incarceration.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Dowdell.

THE WITNESS: I'm ashamed of what I was into and I can assure you, Your Honor, that nothing like this will ever come into my family again.

Mr. Ladd, anything that you would like to say?

THE COURT: The Court, as all courts, desires to encourage cooperation with the United States in all matters and the fact that the United States has filed this motion, this 5(K) 1.1 motion under the guidelines, coupled with the sentencings that this Court has imposed for others, Marteney in particular, in light of all of the circumstances of this case, the Court is going to depart from the sentencing

3 4

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

guidelines downward and going to grant a rarity and that is probation in this case for a period of five years.

So I'm going to spend the imposition of sentence and we'll grant the probation for five years subject to the normal conditions of probation, among which are these: commit any crimes, federal, state or local, that you participate in a program for the treatment of substance abuse. at the discretion of U.S. Probation Office.

Also, it has been brought to the Court's attention that you do have a support system in Chio that's not available elsewhere, so you may travel to and from Ohio. All other standard provisions of probation will apply. The Court also imposes the statutory crime victims fund assessment of \$50,00.

Is there anything further that you desire to present to the Court, Mr. Morgan?

MR. MORGAN: No, sir, I have nothing else.

THE COURT: Mr. Dowdell?

MR. DOWDELL: Nothing further, Judge.

THE COURT: All right, fine. You'll be excused.

Thank you, Judge. MR. MORGAN:

MR. DOWDELL: Thank you, Judge. (END OF PROCEEDINGS)

 THIS IS A TRUE AND CORRECT TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS.

MARY ANN MCGINTY. REPORTER